

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are all the claims pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The objection stated in paragraph 2 of the Office action is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 was dependent on claim 3, whereas claim 11 was dependent on claims 3 and 9, so was of different scope. In any event, the limitations of claim 10 have now been incorporated into claim 11, and the rejection is obviated.

The objection stated in paragraph 3 of the Office action is overcome by the amendments to the claims whereby no claim is dependent on more than one previous claim.

The rejection stated in paragraph 5 of the Office action is respectfully traversed.

The fundamental aspect of the present invention is the changing of a mode of reporting measured radio propagation parameters to the network controller, taking into account the speed of the mobile.

Heinonen teaches reporting measured network parameters, but this much has certainly already been admitted as prior art. Moreau takes speed into account in determining whether to trigger an intercellular handover, e.g., estimating the time instant at which the mobile will cross a cell boundary. But there is nothing in Moreau which suggests that the mode of reporting to a network controller be determined in accordance with detected mobile speed. To the contrary, the mode of reporting never changes in Moreau.

Moreau teaches speed determination but is otherwise not particularly relevant. It certainly does not teach modifying any reporting mode based on the detected speed, only taking the speed into account in determining when the mobile will be at a particular position, which seems quite logical. Heinonen also does not teach modifying its reporting mode in accordance with detected mobile speed. Thus, if one of skill in the art were to consider both references, since the modification of the reporting mode in accordance with mobile speed is not shown in either reference, it would not result from any combination of the teachings of the references.

Accordingly, it is submitted that all claims patentably distinguish over the art of record.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 29, 2007

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703